

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-9 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the sole independent claim. Claims 1-8 are sought to be clarified or broadened. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute similar or broader claims, with respect to any amended claims, in the future. New claim 9 is sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview

The Examiner, Minnah Seoh, and her Primary, Neal Sereboff, are thanked for their time during and after the in-person Examiner Interview held March 4, 2010. Applicant's representatives, Jason D. Eisenberg and Viraj Tipnis, discussed several distinguishing claim features with reference to the applied references. The Examiner and her Primary proposed some claim language and presented additional potential references for Applicant's consideration. No agreement was reached.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to for being illegible in places and including Korean language text. Applicant requests the objection be held in abeyance as Applicant is using a draftsman to prepare formal drawings that Applicant believes should overcome all objections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,047,259 to Campbell et al. ("Campbell"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Campbell simply discloses “a client computer” (col. 3, lines 55-57), but does not explicitly disclose the recited “a service-providing system transmits a doctor web screen, a nurse web screen, and an laboratory web screen for medical information management to a doctor terminal, a nurse terminal, and an laboratory staff terminal.” For example, Campbell does not disclose the recited discriminating a doctor web screen from a nurse web screen.

The Campbell arrangement simply discloses “a patient’s name, age and presenting complaint such as current symptom or care” (Figs. 3 and 4). It does not disclose the recited “medical record forms provided through the web screens so that the user inputs medical information on patients.” Referring to Wikipedia, “Medical record” is defined as “a systematic documentation of a patient’s individual medical history and care.” Thus, “a medical record form” as recited is distinct from Campbell since the medical record form includes past symptom and care history as well as current symptom.

Further, Campbell does not disclose the recited “a menu allowing a user to add, delete and modify the medical record forms” and “providing a list of the medical record forms if there is a request for inspection of the list, and providing the medical record forms selected from the list through the web screens.” To the contrary, Fig. 3 in Campbell does not represent the recited adding, deleting and modifying a form itself (a document including blanks for obtaining various information) and Fig. 4 does not represent the recited window that receives a request for inspection of a list of the medical record forms.

Further, Campbell simply discloses that “during an initial exam, many of the observations listed in the exam screens default to normal,” but does not disclose the recited “the menu allowing the user to directly select a medical record form provided as a default record form through the web screens, and providing the selected medical record form as a default document through the web screens,” For example, “a medical record form provided as a default record form” as recited in claim 1 can be different according to a doctor or a clinical department, and an additional form may be output for allowing a specific record form for each clinical department to be directly created (See, e.g., the instant application par. [0053]). However, “observation” in Campbell is only specified on a patient (not a clinical department).

Therefore, Campbell does not anticipate the claims.

Reply to Office Action of December 24, 2009

Suhung-Gwon KIM
Appl. No. 10/564,561

Accordingly, for any and/or all these above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over the applied reference, and the rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn. Also, at least based on their dependency to claim 1, claims 2-8 and new claim 9 should be found allowable over the applied reference, as well as for their additional distinguishing features.

For example, claim 9 further distinguishes from the applied reference because Campbell does not teach or suggest at least "wherein the medical record forms are forms for inputting and inspecting medical information on patients including treatment information, nursing information, and examination record information through a web screen."


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.


Jason D. Eisenberg
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,447

Date: 5/28/10

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600